

**REMARKS**

**I. Formalities**

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not yet signed and forwarded a copy of the PTO 1449 Form submitted by Applicant with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 3, 2003. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner sign the aforementioned PTO 1449 Form, initial the references cited therein, and return it along with the next office paper.

In addition, the Examiner did not indicate whether the Formal Drawings filed on October, 11, 2000 are accepted, as previously requested of the Examiner in Applicant's Response filed on February 14, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge and approve the aforementioned Formal Drawings.

**II. Status of the Application**

By the present Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-13, 15-16, 18-19, and 21-23 have been amended, and claims 26-30 are hereby added to cover more fully various implementations of the invention. Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the Application, with claims 1, 10, 18, 21, and 25 being in independent form. Claims 1-25 have been rejected.

**III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Terashima in view of Fuller**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,419 to Terashima *et al.* (hereinafter "Terashima") in

view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,760 to Fuller *et al.* (hereinafter “Fuller”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

In order for the Examiner to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, Terashima, Fuller, or some combination thereof, must teach all of the limitations of claims 1-11 and 25. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claims 1-11 and 25.

**A. Independent Claim 1**

First, independent claim 1 requires a combination of elements including *at least*:

reception means for receiving data described  
in a predetermined information description  
language...

The grounds of rejection allege that the RF antenna 11 taught in Terashima, corresponds to a reception means, as recited in Applicant’s claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection, and submits that Terashima fails to teach or suggest a reception means for receiving data described in a predetermined information description language, as required by the combination of elements recited in independent claim 1.

In contrast to the requirements of claim 1, there is no suggestion in Terashima that antenna 11 is for receiving data described in a predetermined information description language, as recited in claim 1. As explained in the present Application, for instance, recent communication terminal devices can transmit and receive not only conventional voice calls, but also data described in a predetermined information description language such as hypertext markup language (“HTML”), Compact HTML, or wireless markup language (“WML”). *See*

Specification, page 6, lines 11-25. Indeed, receiving data described in such information description languages enables communication terminal devices to execute a browsing function for reading various kinds of contents on the Internet. *See* Specification, page 6, lines 23-25. However, Terashima fails to teach or suggest that the data transmitted or received by antenna 11 is described in any sort of information description language whatsoever. As a result, Terashima fails to teach or suggest that antenna 11 is for receiving data described in a predetermined information description language, as required by claim 1.

Moreover, Fuller does not cure the deficient teachings of Terashima, in that, Fuller merely teaches sending encoded messages to a unique pager or beeper. *See* column 6, lines 41-52. Specifically, Fuller teaches that transmit data is passed to packet data encoder 220, which formats the data into packets before sending the packets to antenna 230. *See* column 16, lines 43-47. Subsequently, as taught in Fuller, radio frequency receiver 235 receives the data packets transmitted from antenna 230 and passes them to packet data decoder 240, which removes the packet format and passes the raw received data to the receive data input port 245. *See* column 16, lines 47-51. However, there is no suggestion in Fuller that the data packets received by radio frequency receiver 235 are described in a predetermined information description language, as required by claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests a reception means for receiving data described in a predetermined information description language, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Second, independent claim 1 requires a combination of elements further including *at least*:

code detection means for detecting a predetermined code indicative of the end of data received by the reception means;

The grounds of rejection acknowledge that Terashima fails to teach or suggest a code detection means, as recited in claim 1. *See* Office Action, page 2, paragraph 3. Nevertheless, the grounds of rejection attempt to cure the deficient teachings of Terashima by relying on Fuller, alleging that the detector 275 taught in Fuller corresponds to a code detection means, as required by claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection and submits that Fuller fails to teach or suggest a code detection means for detecting a predetermined code indicative of the end of data received by the reception means, as required by the combination of elements recited in independent claim 1.

In contradistinction, Fuller teaches that detector 275 removes the 40 Kilohertz signal component from the signal received from filter and amplifier 270, and passes the resulting serial data to input port 280. *See* column 16, lines 56-59. That is, Fuller does not provide any suggestion that detector 275 detects a code indicative of the end of the signals that detector 275 receives, as required by claim 1. To the contrary, rather than detecting a code indicative of the end of the data received, detector 275 merely removes the 40 Kilohertz signal component from every packet that detector 275 receives, and forwards the resulting signals to input port 280.

As a result, Fuller fails to teach or suggest that detector 275 is for detecting a predetermined code indicative of the end of the data received by antenna 230, as required by

claim 1. Further, as acknowledged by the grounds of rejection, Terashima does not cure the deficient teachings of Fuller. *See* Office Action, page 2, paragraph 3. Thus, Applicant submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests a code detection means for detecting a predetermined code indicative of the end of data received by the reception means, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Third, independent claim 1 requires a combination of elements further including *at least*:

light-emission control means for stopping light-emission by said light-emitting means upon start of the reception of said data by said reception means...

The grounds of rejection allege that the lighting control signal Scb taught in Terashima corresponds to a light-emission control means, as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection, and submits that Terashima fails to teach or suggest a light-emission control means for stopping light-emission by a light-emitting means upon start of the reception of data by a reception means, as required by the combination of elements recited in independent claim 1.

In contrast to the requirements of claim 1, Terashima teaches that incandescent lamp 46 is the backlight source for the liquid crystal display 16, and that incandescent lamp 46 is turned "ON" when the lighting control signal Scb reaches a high level. *See* column 5, lines 25-32. Conversely, Terashima teaches that incandescent lamp 46 is turned "OFF" when the lighting control signal Scb reaches a low level. *See* column 6, lines 15-18. Further, as shown in Figure 2C of Terashima, control signal Scb reaches a high level (and the incandescent lamp 46 is therefore turned "ON") during the receive and idle slots. *See* Figure 2A; Figure 2C; column 6,

lines 7-9. On the other hand, Terashima teaches that control signal Scb reaches a low level (and the incandescent lamp 46 is therefore turned “OFF”) during the transmit slot. *See* Figure 2A; Figure 2C; column 6, lines 15-18.

Accordingly, Terashima does not teach that control signal Scb stops light-emission by incandescent lamp 46 upon start of the reception of data by antenna 11, as required by claim 1. In fact, Terashima teaches just the opposite—that control signal Scb stops (i.e., turns “OFF”) incandescent lamp 46 upon start of the transmission of data by antenna 11 (i.e., upon the end of the reception of data by antenna 11). Consequently, Terashima does not teach, and is incapable of suggesting, a light-emission control means for stopping light-emission by a light-emitting means upon start of the reception of data by said reception means, as required by claim 1.

Moreover, Fuller does not cure the deficient teachings of Terashima. Indeed, Fuller teaches that encoded messages sent via a radio frequency in a paging system may cause a pager to activate a light. *See* column 6, lines 44-52. Hence, Fuller teaches that upon receiving data, a pager activates a light. Accordingly, Fuller is incapable of teaching that light-emission is stopped upon start of the reception of data, as required by claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests a light-emission control means for stopping light-emission by a light-emitting means upon start of the reception of data by said reception means, as required by claim 1.

Finally, independent claim 1 requires a combination of elements also including *at least*:

...a predetermined code indicative of the end of data received by the reception means; and

light-emission control means for... starting light-emission by said light-emitting means upon detection of said predetermined code by said code detection means.

The grounds of rejection allege that column 6, lines 41-52 of Fuller teach starting light-emission upon detection of a predetermined code, as required by claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection, and submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests a light-emission control means for starting light-emission by a light-emitting means upon detection of a predetermined code by said code detection means, wherein said predetermined code is indicative of the end of data received, as required by the combination of elements recited in independent claim 1.

Indeed, Fuller teaches that encoded messages sent via a radio frequency in a paging system may cause a pager to activate a light. *See* column 6, lines 44-52. However, Fuller does not teach or suggest that the pager taught therein activates a light upon detection of a predetermined code indicative of the end of data received, as required by claim 1. In fact, Fuller provides no suggestion whatsoever of a code indicative of the end of data received, as recited in claim 1 or, for that matter, any suggestion that the pager taught therein detects a code indicative of the end of data received. Thus, Applicant submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests a light-emission control means for starting light-emission by a light-emitting means upon detection of a predetermined code by said code

detection means, wherein said predetermined code is indicative of the end of data received, as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, for *at least* the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 2-9 are patentable over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Thus, the allowance of claims 1-9 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**B. Independent Claim 10**

In view of the similarity between the recitations set forth in claim 10 and the recitations discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 apply at least by analogy to independent claim 10. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, *at least* for these reasons. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claim 11 is patentable over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 10.

Accordingly, the allowance of claims 10-11 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**C. Independent Claim 25**

In view of the similarity between the recitations set forth in claim 25 and the recitations discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 apply at least by analogy to

independent claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is patentable over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, *at least* for these reasons.

Hence, the allowance of claim 25 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Terashima in view of Fuller, and in further view of Sudo**

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima, in view of Fuller, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,827 to Sudo *et al.* (hereinafter “Sudo”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for *at least* the reasons stated below.

In order for the Examiner to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, or some combination thereof, must teach all of the limitations of claims 12-24. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claims 12-24.

**A. Dependent Claims 12-17**

The dependent claims 12-17 incorporate all the novel and non-obvious features of their base claim 10. As explained above with respect to claim 10, neither Terashima, Fuller, nor any combination thereof, teaches the novel limitations of base claim 10. Further, Sudo does not cure the deficient teachings of Terashima and Fuller. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 12-17 are patentable over Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, and any combination thereof, *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 10.

Accordingly, the allowance of claims 12-17 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**B. Independent Claim 18**

In view of the similarity between the recitations set forth in claim 18 and the recitations discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, apply at least by analogy to independent claim 18. Further, Sudo does not cure the deficient teachings of Terashima and Fuller. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is patentable over Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, and any combination thereof, *at least* for these reasons. Additionally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 19-20 are patentable over Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, and any combination thereof, *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 18.

Therefore, the allowance of claims 18-20 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**C. Independent Claim 21**

In view of the similarity between the recitations set forth in claim 21 and the recitations discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 over Terashima, Fuller, and any combination thereof, apply at least by analogy to independent claim 21. Further, Sudo does not cure the deficient teachings of Terashima and Fuller. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is patentable over Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, and any combination thereof, *at least* for these reasons. Additionally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 22-24 are patentable over Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, and any combination thereof, *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 21.

Therefore, the allowance of claims 21-24 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**V. New Claims**

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 26-30 are patentable over Terashima, Fuller, Sudo, and any combination thereof, *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 10, 18, 21, and 25, respectively, and for the recitations set forth therein. Accordingly, the allowance of claims 26-30 is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
**U.S. Application No.: 09/685,770**

**Attorney Docket No.: Q61175**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*Andrew J. Taska*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew J. Taska  
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 8, 2004